

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed April 8, 2005 has been received. Prior to entry of this paper, Claims 21-40 were pending. A telephone interview was held with the Examiner on June 1, 2005 to discuss the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and the objection to the specification. In this paper, Claims 21, 24, and 38-40 are cancelled without prejudice. Claims 22, 23, and 25-37 are currently pending. No new subject matter has been added. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the presently pending claims is in condition for allowance.

Claims 22, 23, 25, 26, and 28 were amended to be re-written in independent form. Additionally, Claims 22 and 33 were amended to change the phrase “at least one of a first transistor and a first diode” to “at least one of a first transistor or a first diode.” As discussed in the telephone interview with the Examiner on June 1, 2005, these amendments to Claims 22 and 33 do not change the scope of the claims and are not amended for reasons related to patentability, but are amended to comply with the intervening change in case law presented by *SuperGuide Corporation v. DirecTV Enterprises, Inc., et al.*, 358 F.3d 870 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 21, 24 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Singer et al. (6,118,326). Applicants respectfully disagree, and respectfully submit that Claims 21, 24, and 38-40 were in condition for allowance prior to entry of this paper. Claim 21 was respectfully submitted to be allowable at least because Singer does not disclose, “wherein the current source circuit is arranged to provide a bias current during an on condition”, as recited in Applicants’ Claim 21 prior to entry of this paper. Claim 24 and 38-40 were respectfully submitted to be allowable at least for similar reasons.

However, because the previous Office Action has been made final, Applicants have cancelled Claims 21, 24, and 38-40 without prejudice in this paper, which renders the rejections to Claims 21, 24, and 38-40 moot. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of cancelled claims 21, 24, and 38-40 in a continuation application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 and objection to the specification

In the Office Action mailed April 8, 2005, claims 21-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. However, Claims 33-37 were identified as being allowable if the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is overcome. Similarly, Claims 22, 23, and 35-32 were identified as being allowable if the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is overcome and if the claims are re-written in independent form.

In the telephone interview held with the Examiner on June 1, 2005, the objection to the specification and the rejection to the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112 were overcome through argument. A summary of the discussion appears below.

The Office Action mailed April 8, 2005 stated, “When the input voltage is high, transistor 840 is turned off and the control voltage (Vgn) is at a fixed value while the input voltage varies and can be at any value, thus the difference between the control input voltage and the input voltage is **not** substantially constant.” (Emphasis in original). However, in the telephone interview with the Examiner, it was discussed that, with regard to Applicants’ Claim 21, if switch circuit 610 is on, transistor 840 operates as a source follower even if the input voltage is high. As discussed, the invention as claimed in Claim 21 is not limited to the embodiment shown in Applicants’ Figure 8, which is described only by way of example.

Further, it was discussed that “the on condition” recited in Claim 1 refers to the switch circuit being on.

Additionally, the Office Action stated, “The applicant is requested to point out in the drawing the first, second, and third transistors” recited in Applicants’ Claim 31. In one embodiment, as illustrated in Applicant’s Figure 9, the first transistor is transistor 930, the second transistor is transistor 840, and the third transistor is transistor 610. The invention as claimed in Applicants’ Claim 31 is not limited to the embodiment illustrated in Applicants’ Figure 9, which is described only by way of example.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 112 and the objection to the specification are overcome based on the telephone interview held on June 1, 2005, and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that each of the presently pending claims (Claims 22, 23, and 25-37) are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is requested. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the below-listed telephone number if it is believed that prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby. Although certain arguments regarding patentability are set forth herein, there may be other arguments and reasons why the claimed invention is patentably distinct. Applicants reserve the right to raise these arguments in the future.

Dated: June 3, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Matthew M. Gaffney
Matthew M. Gaffney
Registration No.: 46,717

Matthew M. Gaffney

Registration No.: 46,717

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(206) 262-8900

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

Customer No.: 38845